



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/652,330

08/29/2003

Uri Elzur

13783US02

1614

23446 7590 06/18/2010  
MCANDREWS HELD & MALLOY, LTD  
500 WEST MADISON STREET  
SUITE 3400  
CHICAGO, IL 60661

EXAMINER

HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2452

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/18/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/652,330	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ELZUR ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HIEU HOANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21, 25 and 33-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21, 25 and 33-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)         | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 04/19/2010.
2. Claims 18-21, 25, 33-41 are pending.

### ***Reopening Prosecution***

3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 05/05/2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

A decision to reopen the prosecution has been made with approval of a supervisory patent examiner.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of new ground of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**6. Claims 18, 20, 21, and 36-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philbrick et al. (US 2001/0037406, hereafter Philbrick), in view of Haviv (US 2002/0059451) and Hayes (US 2003/0046330)**

7. For claim 18, Philbrick discloses a server, comprising:

- a single integrated convergence network controller chip (fig. 6, fig. 1, network interface card INIC 22);
- a Ethernet connector for handling a plurality of different types of network traffic (fig. 16, one of the Ethernet connectors for receiving multiple traffic types, [0065], SCSI and TCP, or Etherstorage or SEP and TCP, [0069] lines 20-23, different storage protocols over TCP/IP, [0084], [0085], NAS traffic and network storage traffic over network line 644, utilizing iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, [0085], iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, fig. 15, [0093], [0097], [0099], NAS, RTP/RTCP and SIP and MGCP)),

Art Unit: 2452

- the single connector is coupled to the single integrated convergent network controller chip ([0066] lines 12-15, Ethernet connector 424 coupled to the INIC),
- the single integrated convergence network controller chip is operable to concurrently process the plurality of different types of traffic ([0065] lines 15-21, at least two traffics SCSI and TCP/IP, fig. 14, [0084], [0085], NAS traffic and network storage traffic over network line 644, utilizing iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, [0085], iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, fig. 15, [0093], [0097], [0099], NAS, RTP/RTCP and SIP and MGCP)).

Philbrick does not explicitly disclose different types of network traffic transported via a single fabric for the plurality of servers; the single fabric is coupled to a plurality of servers.

However, Haviv discloses different types of network traffic transported via a single fabric for the plurality of servers; the single fabric is coupled to a plurality of servers (fig. 5, [0014], [0019], [0022], [0044], servers 54 and a single fabric connecting to servers for transporting different traffic types, RDMA over TCP/IP, SAN, SCSI RDMA, socket direct protocol... for the servers)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Philbrick and Haviv to utilize a single chip for processing multiple traffic types for a plurality of servers via a single fabric in order to reduce usage of hardware and/or network resources and costs.

Philbrick discloses a network interface card (NIC) with 4 different connectors for the purpose of serving 4 different conduits (fig. 16 and [0066], [0067] and [0106]).

Art Unit: 2452

Philbrick-Haviv does not disclose a network interface card with a single Ethernet connector.

However, Hayes discloses a NIC with a single connector (fig. 5, [0026], single PHY interface connected to the network, [0018], [0020], NIC handling both offload protocol traffics and regular traffics)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to reduce the number of interfaces in Philbrick to a single physical interface taught by Hayes. The motivation would be to implement one single interface or connector for the case of one conduit running a plurality of traffics, and also reduce the making cost of the NIC by reducing support for other conduits.

8. For claim 20, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes further discloses the blade server has a single Internet protocol (IP) address (Philbrick, [0053] IP address).

9. For claim 21, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes further discloses the plurality of servers is part of a data center (Philbrick, fig. 14, storage center), and the data center comprises a plurality of other servers coupled to each other via the single fabric (Haviv, fig. 5).

10. For claim 25, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes further discloses the plurality of different types of traffic comprises at least two of network traffic, storage traffic, interprocess communication (IPC) traffic and cluster traffic (Philbrick, [0065] lines 15-21, network traffic TCP/IP and storage traffic SCSI, Haviv, [0019]).

11. For claim 36, Philbrick discloses a system for communication, the system comprising: a single integrated convergent network controller chip that enables concurrent hardware, firmware and software processing functionalities of a plurality of different types of traffic that are received via a layer 2 (L2) connector (fig. 6, [0065] lines 15-21, a single integrated network controller INIC 400 with an L2 SAN connector for at least two traffics (SCSI and TCP/IP traffics), fig. 14, [0084], [0085], NAS traffic and network storage traffic over network line 644, utilizing iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, [0085], iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, fig. 15, [0093], [0097], [0099], fast path audio and video traffics and real time voice/video traffics and NAS, RTP/RTCP and SIP and MGCP, fig. 13, protocol processing using the INIC is hardware and driver—software/firmware)

Philbrick does not explicitly disclose the connector is communicatively coupled to a plurality of servers via a single fabric.

However, Haviv discloses transporting different types of network traffic transported via a single fabric for the plurality of servers (fig. 5, [0014], [0019], [0022], [0044], servers 54 and a single fabric connecting to servers for transporting different traffic types, RDMA over TCP/IP, SAN, SCSI RDMA, socket direct protocol... for the servers)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Philbrick and Haviv to utilize a single chip for processing

Art Unit: 2452

multiple traffic types for a plurality of servers via a single fabric in order to reduce usage of hardware and/or network resources and costs.

Philbrick discloses a network interface card (NIC) with 4 different connectors for the purpose of serving 4 different conduits (fig. 16 and [0066], [0067] and [0106]).

Philbrick-Haviv does not disclose a network interface card with a single Ethernet connector.

However, Hayes discloses a NIC with a single connector (fig. 5, [0026], single PHY interface connected to the network, [0018], [0020], NIC handling both offload protocol traffics and regular traffics)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to reduce the number of interfaces in Philbrick and Haviv to a single physical interface taught by Hayes. The motivation would be to implement one single interface or connector for the case of one conduit running a plurality of traffics, and also reduce the making cost of the NIC by reducing support for other conduits.

12. For claim 37, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes discloses said single integrated convergent network controller chip comprises a layer 2 network interface card (L2 NIC) (Philbrick, [0065] lines 7-11, Ethernet, fig. 24, MAC controller), a transmission control protocol (TCP) processor, an iSCSI processor ([0065] lines 15-21, iSCSI processing over TCP/IP) and a remote direct memory access (RDMA) processor (fig. 25, DMA controller), and a Management Agent processor ([0106], last sentence).



Art Unit: 2452

13. For claim 38, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes discloses said plurality of different types of network traffic comprises at least two of a network traffic, storage traffic, interprocess communication (IPC) traffic and cluster traffic (Philbrick, fig. 6, [0065] lines 15-21, a single L2 SAN connector in an INIC (integrated circuit) for both storage SCSI traffic and network TCP/IP traffic).

14. For claims 39-41, the claims are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 36-38 respectively.

**15. Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philbrick, and further in view of Microsoft (03/03/2001, Winsock Direct and Protocol Offload on SANs), and in view of Hayes.**

16. For claim 33, Philbrick discloses a method for communication, the method comprising:

in a data center, accessing a storage system over a single fabric, wherein said single fabric comprises a layer 2 (L2) connector coupled to a single integrated convergent network controller chip that is enabled to concurrently process a plurality of different types of traffic (fig. 6, L2 connector coupled to the INIC-- integrated convergent network controller chip, [0065] lines 15-21, L2 connector for network traffic TCP/IP and storage traffic SCSI, fig. 14, [0084], [0085], NAS traffic and network storage traffic over network line 644, utilizing iSCSI and TCP/NetBios/SMB, [0085], iSCSI and

Art Unit: 2452

TCP/NetBios/SMB, fig. 15, [0093], [0097], [0099], fast path audio and video traffics and real time voice/video traffics and NAS, RTP/RTCP and SIP and MGCP); and accessing a network over the single fabric ([0065] lines 15-21, network traffic TCP/IP and storage traffic SCSI).

Philbrick does not explicitly disclose accessing a cluster over the single fabric.

However, Microsoft discloses accessing a cluster over the single fabric (fig. 2, page 5 lines 7-8, RDMA support for clustering traffic, RDMA running over TCP/IP).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Philbrick and Microsoft to further provide more functions such as RDMA support on an iSCSI-enabled NIC of Philbrick.

Philbrick discloses a network interface card (NIC) with 4 different connectors for the purpose of serving 4 different conduits (fig. 16 and [0066], [0067] and [0106]).

Philbrick-Haviv does not disclose a network interface card with a single Ethernet connector.

However, Hayes discloses a NIC with a single connector (fig. 5, [0026], single PHY interface connected to the network, [0018], [0020], NIC handling both offload protocol traffics and regular traffics)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to reduce the number of interfaces in Philbrick and Haviv to a single physical interface taught by Hayes. The motivation would be to implement one single interface or connector for the case of one conduit running a plurality of traffics, and also reduce the making cost of the NIC by reducing support for other conduits.

17. For claim 34, Philbrick-Microsoft-Hayes further discloses said accessing of said storage system over said single fabric are performed over a single connector of a server in the data center (Philbrick, fig. 6, single connector 424).

18. For claim 35, Philbrick-Microsoft-Hayes further discloses said single integrated convergent network controller chip coupled to the single Ethernet connector has a single Internet protocol (IP) address (Philbrick, [0053] IP address).

**19. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes, in view of what was known in the art.**

20. For claim 19, Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes does not explicitly disclose the server comprises a blade server, and wherein the integrated chip is part of a blade mounted in the blade server.

However, Official notice is taken that it was well known in the art that a blade server comprises a plurality of servers, and the single integrated convergent network controller chip is part of a blade mounted in the blade server.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply Philbrick-Haviv-Hayes to a blade server system to make use of advantages of a blade server system such as high space density.

***Conclusion***

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HH/

Examiner, AU 2452

/THU NGUYEN/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2452